



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,866	03/12/2004	Hisashi Fukuda	FUJO 14.947A	2656
26304 7590 09/01/2011 KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP 575 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585				
EXAMINER				
HOQUE, NAFIZ E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/01/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

nycuspto@kattenlaw.com
brendy.belony@kattenlaw.com
samson.helfgott@kattenlaw.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/799,866

Applicant(s)

FUKUDA ET AL.

Examiner

NAFIZ E. HOQUE

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36-43 and 101 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36-43 and 101 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 44-100 and 102-106 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments filed on June 13, 2011 have been entered. No claims have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Claims 36-43 and 101 are still pending in this application, with claims 36 and 101 being independent.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 36-43 and 101 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 101 recites "computer-readable storage medium". The specification describe as "through a network line 5903" (spec, page 141, line 19-20). Therefore, it can interpreted as a "signal" in which a "signal" embodying functional descriptive material is neither a process ("actions"), machine, manufacture nor composition of matter (i.e., tangible "thing") and therefore does not fall within one of the four categories of § 101. Rather "signal" is a form of energy, in the absence of any physical structure or tangible material. Examiner recommends using "**non-transitory**

computer-readable storage medium” to overcome the rejection. Please see, “Subject Matter Eligibility of Computer Readable Media” in Official Gazette Notice 1351 OG 212 (February 23, 2010):

“The broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to a computer readable medium (also called machine readable medium and other such variations) typically covers forms of non-transitory tangible media and transitory propagating signals per se in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of computer readable media, particularly when the specification is silent. See MPEP 2111.01. When the broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim covers a signal per se, the claim must be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as covering non-statutory subject matter.”

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 36, 41-43 and 101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farfan et al. (US 5,875,231) in view of Bogart et al. (US 4,488,004) and in further view of Albrecht (US 5,268,957).

Regarding claims 36 and 101, Farfan discloses a computer telephony integration client unit (fig. 13, element 1303) for transmitting computer telephony integration control request information for use in requesting computer telephony integration control to a computer telephony integration server unit (fig. 13, element 1302), comprising:

a computer telephony integration control request information editing unit that edits the computer telephony integration control request information (col. 7, lines 2-16); and

a communications control unit that communicates with the computer telephony integration server unit through a computer network the computer telephony integration control request information and information relating to the computer telephony integration control request information (fig. 13 – shows communicating with a server in a LAN) so that the computer telephony integration server unit executes a hold service (abstract; see fig. 2).

Farfan does not disclose when a call from a first telephony device connected with a first private branch exchange to a second telephony device connected with a second private branch exchange through a public telephone network cannot be connected due to the second telephony device being busy; and executing a camp-on control between the second telephony device and the first telephony device by controlling the second private branch exchange using the received control request information.

Bogart discloses when a call from a first telephony device connected with a first private branch exchange to a second telephony device connected with a second private branch exchange cannot be connected due to the second telephony device being busy

(col. 19, lines 13-21 – busy tone); and executing a camp-on control between the second telephony device and the first telephony device by controlling the second private branch exchange using the received control request information (col. 19, lines 12-41 – auto callback).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farfan in view of Bogart to get an immediate callback when the user becomes available.

Farfan in view of Bogart does not explicitly disclose wherein the connection is through a public telephone network and cannot be connected due to the second telephony device being busy; and executing a camp-on control between the second telephony device and the first telephony device by controlling the second private branch exchange using the received control request information.

Albrecht discloses wherein the connection is through a public telephone network (see fig. 1; col. lines 47-49 - central office) and cannot be connected due to the second telephony device being busy (fig. 2 - busy); and executing a camp-on control between the second telephony device and the first telephony device by controlling the second private branch exchange using the received control request information (col. 4, lines 4-20 - see camp-on service; also vm system 16 is part of the pbx 12 - see fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farfan in view of Bogart in the teachings of Albrecht to playback notes to the calling party when a camp-on request call is completed (see fig. 3, element 214).

Regarding claim 41, Farfan discloses wherein a source terminal unit and a destination terminal unit communicate with each other through an exchange unit and a switching network to which the exchange unit is connected (fig. 1, elements 101 and 102).

Regarding claim 42, Farfan discloses wherein a source terminal unit and a destination terminal unit are connected to an exchange unit and communicate with each other through an extension network controlled by the exchange unit (fig. 13, element 1301).

Regarding claim 43, Farfan discloses an exchange unit used in the computer telephony integration control system according to claim 36 (fig. 13, element 1301).

7. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farfan et al. (US 5,875,231) in view of Bogart et al. (US 4,488,004) and in view of Albrecht (US 5,268,957) and in further view of Iida et al. (US 5,577,111).

Regarding claim 37, Farfan discloses computer telephony integration (see fig. 13).

Farfan in view of Bogart and Albrecht does not disclose wherein said computer telephony integration control request information contains information specifying issue/non-issue of a result notification and information specifying a monitor time; and when information specifying issue of the result notification is set in the computer telephony integration control request information, said computer telephony integration

server unit returns a notification as to whether or not the computer telephony integration control has been successfully performed within the monitor time set in the computer telephony integration control request information.

lida discloses wherein said computer telephony integration control request information contains information specifying issue/non-issue of a result notification and information specifying a monitor time; and when information specifying issue of the result notification is set in the computer telephony integration control request information, said computer telephony integration server unit returns a notification as to whether or not the computer telephony integration control has been successfully performed within the monitor time set in the computer telephony integration control request information (col. 9, lines 20-34; fig. 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farfan in view of Bogart and Albrecht with teaching of lida to set a time for the request and cancel the camp-on request if it is not answered within a certain period to avoid having a request that is infinitely long (lida, col. 9, lines 20-34).

8. Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farfan et al. (US 5,875,231) in view of Bogart et al. (US 4,488,004) and in view of Albrecht (US 5,268,957) and in further view of Farris (US 5,692,033).

Regarding claim 38, Farfan discloses a source terminal unit capable of calling a call from the exchange unit to a destination terminal unit (see figs. 1, 13).

Farfan in view of Bogart and Albrecht do not disclose wherein said computer telephony integration control refers to two-point connection control to connect a source terminal unit capable of releasing a call from the exchange unit to a destination terminal unit.

Farris discloses wherein said computer telephony integration control refers to two-point connection control to connect a source terminal unit capable of releasing a call from the exchange unit to a destination terminal unit (col. 3, lines 29-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Farfan in view of Bogart and Albrecht with teaching of Farris to automatically connect the call when the line is available (Farris, col. 3, lines 31-37).

Regarding claim 39, Farris discloses wherein said two-point connection control is periodically performed until the destination terminal unit answers (col. 3, lines 45-52).

Regarding claim 40, Farris discloses wherein said two-point connection control is performed upon receipt of a call release notification indicating that the destination terminal unit is ready (col. 2, lines 13-16).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nafiz E. Hoque whose telephone number is (571) 270-1811. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F Alternate Fridays Off 7:30 - 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar can be reached on 571-272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nafiz E Hoque/
Examiner, Art Unit 2614

/Ahmad F Matar/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614